

R E M A R K S

Claims 1-8, 11-18, 20-21 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended, claims 9 and 19 have been cancelled, and claims 20 and 21 have been added. A minor typographical error in the specification has also been corrected. No new matter has been added by way of the above amendments. For instance, the subject matter added to claim 1 is supported by claim 19, now canceled. The amendments to claim 8 are supported by claim 1, which also recites "monoclonal". Newly added claim 20 is the same as previously pending claim 1, except that it also recites the subject matter taken from claim 6. Newly added claim 21 is supported by the present specification at page 7, line 28 to page 8, line 3. Applicants have also corrected the specification at page 8, lines 7 and 9. In particular, Applicants have replaced the recitation of "Cationic" with "Anionic" at page 8, line 7. One of ordinary skill in the art understands that "Anionic" should have been used at this location since the examples listed at this location (e.g., higher fatty acid salts, alkyl arylsulfonates, alkyl sulfonates and alkyl sulfonic acid esters) are "anionic" surfactants rather than cationic surfactants. Likewise, Applicants have replaced the recitation of "anionic" with "cationic" at page 8, line 9. One of ordinary skill in the art understands that "cationic"

should have been used at this location since the examples listed at this location (e.g., alkyl pyridinium salts, alkyl trimethyl ammonium salts, and alkyl polyoxyethylene amines) are "cationic" surfactants rather than anionic surfactants. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and allow the currently pending claims.

Issues under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for the reasons recited at page 2 of the outstanding Office Action. Applicants traverse this rejection.

First, Applicants point out that claim 10 was canceled in the August 12, 2002 Amendment. Thus, the Examiner's rejection of claim 10 is improper.

Second, regarding the Examiner's rejection of claims 8 and 9, Applicants submit that claim 8 has been amended to recite "monoclonal" antibody as also recited in claim 1. Additionally, claim 9 has been canceled. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 8 and 9 is also moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal thereof are respectfully requested.

Issues under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being obvious over Aoki et al. (Clinica Chimica ACTA (Dec. 15, 1988) 178(2) 193-204) in view of Voet et al. (Biochemistry 1990) and Aoki et al. (JP 11151085A) (Aoki-JP).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants note that at page 6 of the outstanding Office Action, claims 6 and 19 have been indicated as allowable. Applicants note that independent claim 1 now recites the subject matter of previously pending claim 19. Accordingly, claim 1 as well as claim 8, which depends thereon, are in condition for allowance. Since claims 9 and 10 have been canceled, the above 103(a) rejection is moot.

Regarding newly added claims 20 and 21, Applicants note that claim 20 is similar to previously pending claim 1, except that the subject matter from claim 6 has been amended into claim 20. Thus, newly added claim 20, as well as claim 21, which depends thereon, are also free of this rejection.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 2-5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Aoki in view of Voet and Aoki-JP, further in view of Lapicola. Applicants traverse this rejection.

As indicated above, independent claim 1 now recites the subject matter of claim 19, which was indicated by the Examiner to be allowable. Accordingly, claims 2-5 and 7, which depend upon claim 1, are likewise in condition for allowance. Accordingly, this rejection is moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal thereof are respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and allow the currently pending claims. In particular, Applicants submit the present claims fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and 35 U.S.C. 103(a). As such, all outstanding rejections are overcome.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Craig M. McRobbie (Reg. No. 42,874) at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants respectfully petition for a two (2) month extension of time for filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee of \$410.00 is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees

Appl. No. 09/715,172

required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By  #42.874

Gerald M. Murphy, Jr., #28,977

GMM/CAM:bmp
2167-0116P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

Attachment